

Appl. No. 09/408,943  
Amendment and/or Response  
Reply to Office action of 16 June 2004

Page 8 of 10

### REMARKS

Claims 1-20, and 22-24 are pending in this application. Claims 21 and 25 are canceled herein. The claims are not narrowed in scope and no new matter is added. Entry after final action is proper because the scope of the claims is not changed and no further searching is required.

The Office action rejects:

claims 1-10 and 18-25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Abecassis (USP 6,553,178),

claims 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Abecassis and Jain et al. (USP 6,463,444), and

claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Abecassis.

The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-17 depend, and claim 24 specifically recite a method for processing video, wherein information from an additional source is displayed based on a user's selection of a feature in the processed video.

Claims 18 and 19 each claim an apparatus for processing video that includes a processor that is configured to display information based on a user's selection of a feature in the processed video.

Claim 20 claims a software program that is configured to display information based on a user's selection of a feature in the processed video.

The Office action relies upon Jain for teaching a voice-to-text process. The applicant concurs with this characterization of Jain.

Abecassis teaches a system and method that allows a user to receive compensation for viewing advertisements (Abecassis' Abstract). While the advertisement is being displayed, the user can select a button in another window to obtain additional information (Abecassis' FIG. 12). That is, in Abecassis, the display of additional information is based on the user's selection of information outside of the video being displayed, whereas, the applicant specifically claims a user's selection of a feature in the

Appl. No. 09/408,943  
Amendment and/or Response  
Reply to Office action of 16 June 2004

Page 9 of 10

processed video. Example techniques for selecting a feature in the processed video are presented at page 12, line 7 through page 14, line 11.

Because Abecassis does not teach or suggest displaying information from a second source based on a user's selection of a feature in the processed video, as specifically claimed in each of claims 1, 18-20, and 24, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the above rejection of claims 1-20 and 24.

Claim 22 claims an apparatus for processing video that includes a processor that determines an association between a feature in a video segment and an additional source that includes the feature, and uses the association to enable display of information from the additional source.

Claim 23 claims a software program that determines an association between a feature in a video segment and an additional source that includes the feature, and uses the association to enable display of information from the additional source.

As noted above, Abecassis teaches a system and method that allows a user to receive compensation for viewing advertisements. Abecassis transmits the requested video, and also the means for displaying and selecting choices based on the displayed advertisement. Abecassis is silent with regard to how the displayed choices are defined, but it is clear from Abecassis' disclosure that the displayed choices are transmitted to the user's device concurrent with the transmission of the advertisement. That is, the user's device does not determine the association between the advertisement video and the selectable choices.

In the applicant's claims 22 and 23, the apparatus and/or software program that determines the association between a video segment and selectable features is the same apparatus and/or software program that enables the display of information from an additional source based on the association.

Because Abecassis does not teach an apparatus and/or software program that determines an association between a feature in a video segment and an additional source that includes the feature, and uses the association to enable display of information from the additional source, as specifically claimed in each of claims 22 and 23, the applicant

Appl. No. 09/408,943  
Amendment and/or Response  
Reply to Office action of 16 June 2004

Page 10 of 10

respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claims 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Abecassis.

In view of the foregoing, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the present application to be in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert M. McDermott, Esq.

Reg. No. 41,508

804-493-0707